



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,687	04/16/2001	Knuth Albertsen	PHD 99.105US	2360

7590 12/13/2002

Philips Electronics North America Corporation
580 White Plains Road
Tarrytown, NY 10591

EXAMINER

HA, NGUYEN T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2831

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10/014,086

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/807,687

Applicant(s)
Aachen et al

Examiner
Nguyen Ha

Art Unit
2831



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 7, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2831

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2831

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen et al (5,889,647) in view of Saito et al (6,288,890).

Regarding claim 1, Hansen et al discloses an electronic component shown in figure 1 with a dielectric (1) and at least one electrode (2) characterized in that the dielectric comprises a composite consisting of a dielectric ceramic material (column 3 lines 46-47).

Hansen et al lack the dielectric comprises an organic polymer. However, Saito et al teaches the dielectric comprises an organic polymer (column 1 lines 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hansen capacitor as taught by Saito to have an organic polymer for the dielectric in order to use under high temperature for the capacitor, since the organic polymer have a high temperature.

Regarding claims 2-3, the teaching of Saito et al includes an organic polymer comprises a polyimide(column 7 lines 45-46). It is inherently to known that the polyimide organic polymer is insolubel in water.

Regarding claim 4, Hansen et al discloses the dielectric ceramic material has a low temperature-dependence/ temperature coefficient (column 2 lines 24-30).

Regarding claim 5, Hansen et al discloses an electronic component wherein the electrodes comprises Ag, Au, Cu, (column 4 lines 2-4).

Regarding claim 6, Hansen et al discloses an electronic component wherein the electronic component is chosen from the group comprising capacitor (column 3 lines 29-40).

Art Unit: 2831

Regarding claims 7-10, a method of manufacturing an electronic component are necessitated by the device structure as it is disclosed by Hansen et al in view of Saito. Hansen discloses an electronic component (figure 1) comprising a dielectric (1) and at least one electrode (2) characterized in that the dielectric comprises a composite consisting of a dielectric ceramic material (column 3 lines 46-47).

Hansen et al lack the dielectric comprises an organic polymer. However, Saito et al teaches the dielectric comprises an organic polymer (column 1 lines 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hansen capacitor as taught by Saito to have an organic polymer for the dielectric in order to use under high temperature for the capacitor, since the organic polymer have a high temperature.

Regarding claim 11, Hansen et al discloses a dielectric ceramic component characterized in that it comprises a composite of a dielectric ceramic material and an organic polymer (column 4 lines 9-16).

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hirai et al (5,448,209) in view of Saito et al (6,288,890).

Regarding claim 12, Hirai et al discloses a dielectric filter with an electronic component which comprises a dielectric (10) and at least two electrodes (20,24), characterized in that the dielectric comprises a composite of a dielectric ceramic material (column 8 lines 3-11).

Hirai et al lack the dielectric comprises an organic polymer.

Art Unit: 2831

However, Saito et al teaches the dielectric comprises an organic polymer (column 1 lines 18-21).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hirai capacitor as taught by Saito to have an organic polymer for the dielectric in order to use under high temperature for the capacitor, since the organic polymer have a high temperature.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nguyen Ha whose telephone number is (703)-308-6023 Monday to Friday from 8:30 to 6:00PM.

Any attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dean Reichard , can be reached on (703) 308-3682. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



NH

**ANTHONY DINKINS
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

12/4/2002